



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,848	12/22/2000	William Silver	264793 / C00-032	8548

7590 07/02/2003  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
1600 TYSONS BOULEVARD  
McLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

6

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/74/848

Applicant(s)

Silver et al

Examiner

Sax

Group Art Unit

2174

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3- MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-93 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-93 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2174

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application has been examined.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blowers et al (6298474) and Kiraly et al (6088731).
4. Regarding claim 1, Blowers et al show selecting via a user interface on a given device a machine vision tool (Figure 2, column 3 lines 25-35, column 8 lines 35-40 and 49-57), selecting via the user interface training information (column 3 lines 60-68, column 8 lines 47-65), sending the selected training information to the device and tool (column 9 lines 7-30), commanding the device to train the tool using the information (column 9 lines 7-37, column 10 lines 1-24, column 11 lines 43-7). Blowers et al do not show the interface being a web browser, but do show effective communication for training and collecting information to a separate interface (column 13 lines 3-10). Furthermore, Kiraly et al show a web browser interface (column 6 lines 50-60) in

Art Unit: 2174

a system which trains and collects information to a separate interface (Figure 4, column 10 lines 45-68, column 11 lines 10-30). This is done for effective communication for training and collecting information to a separate interface. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have the web browser in Blowers et al, because it would allow convenient effective communication for training and collecting information to a separate interface.

5. Regarding claim 2, the training information includes entering training parameters (Blowers et al column 9 lines 7-12).

6. Regarding claim 3, an imaging device is selected, and an image acquiring device thereto connected is commanded to acquire an image and send it to the tool device (Blowers et al column 9 lines 40-45, column 13 lines 3-10). Using the web browser is obvious as explained in paragraph 4 of this Office Action.

7. Regarding claim 4, in addition to what is mentioned in paragraph 6 of this Office Action, note that the image is acquired during training selection (Blowers et al column 9 lines 1-10).

Art Unit: 2174

8. Regarding claim 5, in addition to the above, the image is displayed on the display of the device and a region of interest is selected and sent to the tool device (Blowers et al column 9 lines 44-65).

9. Regarding claim 6, the tool device and the interface may be the same device (Figure 2 of Blowers et al). The obviousness for the interface to be the web browser is explained above.

10. Claim 7 shows the same features as above and is rejected for the same reasons.

11. Regarding claim 8, the training information includes an outline drawn on a screen using a pointing device (Blowers et al Figures 7-8, column 8 lines 9-20).

12. Regarding claim 9, an indicator of the file is included in the training information (Blowers et al column 10 lines 51-57).

13. Regarding claim 10, the information includes CAD data (Blowers et al column 8 lines 22-25), but neither Blowers et al nor Kiraly et al show specific DXF files or AutoCAD data.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that DXF files with AutoCAD data are well known in the art, as applicants even state in the specification page 8. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to include DXF files with AutoCAD data in the Blowers et al

Art Unit: 2174

machine vision tool training system, because it would be a convenient way to communicate training information.

14. Regarding claim 11, a training model is produced (Blowers et al column 9 lines 15-25, column 11 lines 15-47).

15. Regarding claims 12 and 13, the model is stored in the interface device or the tool device (Blowers et al column 9 lines 15-25).

16. Claims 14-17 show the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons.

17. Regarding claim 18, a live image is updated on the screen (Blowers et al Figure 7, column 9 lines 12-16).

18. Claims 19-27 show the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons, including the obviousness of having the web browser as the interface on the display.

19. Regarding claims 28-31, Kiraly et al show the HTML format (column 11 lines 20-25 for example) as part of the browser system. Neither Blowers et al nor Kiraly et al specifically show the XML or Java applets, but the Examiner takes Official Notice that these are well known in the

Art Unit: 2174

art. It would be obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to use them in a browser communication system for convenient communication.

20. Claims 32-38 show the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons.

21. Regarding claim 39, multiple devices may have a machine vision tool (Blowers et al Figure 2, column 7 lines 60-68).

22. Regarding claims 40-43, in addition to the aforementioned, the obviousness to use the web browser has been stated above. Kiraly et al transmits this information over the Internet (column 2 lines 63-66). It is inherent in a web system, that data is transmitted remotely, between separate devices which may be in different buildings.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Steve Sax at telephone number (703) 305-9582.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Sax whose telephone number is (703) 305-9582. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

Art Unit: 2174

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	After Final Communication
(703) 746-7239	Official Communication
(703) 746-7420	For Status Inquiries, draft communication

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



STEVEN SAX  
PRIMARY EXAMINER